

**The Miami-Dade MPO
Freight Transportation Advisory Committee**



MEETING INFORMATION

Stephen P. Clark County Building
Wednesday – November 15, 2006
MPO Conference Room 9th Floor
2:00 PM

AGENDA

- Self Introductions
Chairwoman Sylvia Bernstein
- Approve Agenda
- Approve Meeting Minutes – October , 2006
- Provide input to Truck Route Study
The Corradino Group
- Presentation of Draft Rail Access to Port Study
Cambridge Systematics
- Finalize List of New Studies for next UPWP
- Approve Committee By-laws
- Adjourn



FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTES
Wednesday, November 15, 2006

The November meeting of FTAC was held at 2:00 pm in the MPO Conference Room.

The following individuals were in attendance:

FTAC Members

Sylvia Bernstein	FTAC Chair
Jorge Roviroso	FTAC Vice-Chair
Del Bryan	Overtown Adv. Board
Mariella Marrero	(By phone)
Eddie Rodriguez	P&L Towing
Rafael Puga	FFTA
Felipe Munoz	

Guests

Fran Bohnsack	Miami River Marine Group
Bill Arata	Biscayne Bay Pilots
Rolando Jiminez Jr.	PWA

Staff

Larry Foutz	Miami-Dade MPO
-------------	----------------

Consultants

Thomas Ellert	CH2M Hill
Peter Haliburton	Cambridge Systematics
Bob Gollnik	Cambridge Systematics
Joe Corradino	TCG

The Chair moved directly into Consultant Reports. Joe Corradino began with the Dade County Truck Route Study. He noted that the agency kick-off meeting for the study had been held the day before and the agencies had been most helpful and cooperative. He ran briefly through the Scope of work. He stated that the purpose of the study was to identify actual truck routes and policies for each route. Importantly the study would layout the steps necessary for each route. Joe pointed out that MDX had provided a plan for a truck route from the Port along I-395, to I-95, to SR 112, past the Airport along NW 36th Street to the FEC Yard.

FTAC members made the following comments:

- Can the study look at Short Sea shipping
- Truck toll lanes
- Get truckers on the study committee. Their input critical.
- Enforcement is the key to any trucking restrictions.
- Limiting trucking to a lane is reasonable.
- Cannot restrict hours
- Already has aggressive weight restrictions from the Port but not for Rock haulers.
- Having lower speeds for trucks is counter productive.

A number of truckers were identified for the consultant to work with. FTAC members would provide contact information for the following:

- Steve/Richard Armaleni
- Ray Leonard-Leonard Trucking
- George Mora-Southern Cartage.

These gentlemen were also suggested as possible members of the FTAC to be presented to Commissioner Moss as his appointee.

The Chair told Joe that she expected the study to be completed in 60 days. Joe stated that 60 days was not possible and he would shoot for 5 to 6 months. Staff indicated that it was critical for this study to obtain buy-in from the owners of the facilities, ie FDOT, Turnpike, MDX and Public Works. The buy-in was more important than speed.

The Chair asked Cambridge to present the Rail Access Study. Staff introduced the study by indicating that Commissioner Winton had specifically asked for the study of a Rail Tunnel to consolidate freight going into and out of the Port similar to the Alameda Corridor. It was mentioned that the cost alone was enough to kill the project.

Bob Gollnik went through the handout reiterating the purpose of the study. Within the handout he pointed out the magnitude of Port activity, that 65% of the cargo was for the local market, truck routes through downtown Miami, and the forecast growth of the Port. The growth in passenger volumes was questioned, but the volumes were the latest projections from Transsystems. Other planned enhancement projects were briefly discussed, including Miami River Drayage. Bob introduced Tom Ellert who began to talk about the rail facet of the study. At the mention of the On-Port Intermodal Container Facility (ICF) it was asked if FEC had yet revealed a time frame for trying to move the ICF forward. Tom indicated that the ICF had not moved beyond the discussion stage. Tom provided two options for the tunnel –bored versus immersed tube. The depth of the two tunnels options made a tremendous difference in the feasibility. The bored tunnel had to be much deeper and left little room on the Port for the ICF. Staff pointed out that the immersed tube alternative for the Truck Tunnel had been rejected during the environmental process. The consultant admitted that the environmental issues would be difficult with the immersed tube. The consultant was recommending an open-cut section through downtown. Two rail yards options for the Port Area were presented. The “Tacoma Model” would accommodate 75,000 units and the 70” ICW Crane could accommodate 250,000 units. Both yards required 18 acres of Port property.

Tom was asked about the cost and he responded that the people who looked at it had not been willing to estimate the cost because there were too many variables, but that it was in excess of \$500 million.

Staff instructed the consultant to bring back information that could be used to either approve the project or reject it. Decision makers needed the following information.

- Demand for rail transport – how much would be carried?
- Cost of the facility
- Life cycle time frame that could be used to calculate

The Chair reminded the committee that the minutes had been sent out prior to the meeting. No action was taken on the minutes for lack of a quorum.

Staff introduced the next agenda item, which was a discussion of potential Unified Planning Work Program items to be submitted for consideration by the FTAC. From the previous discussion four projects were identified in one of the agenda attachments>

- Truck toll lanes
- Miami River Transport Zone
- Freight Movement Study for Doral/Medley
- Operational Impacts of Short Sea Drayage.

It was requested that short Sea Drayage be specifically identified in the Miami River Transport Zone. The ideas of Monorails along the Freeways were introduced – Staff suggested that that idea was transit and not freight, was the committee interested? The Committee agreed that we did not want to pursue purely transit projects.

Two other projects were initiated:

- Off peak hour freight shipment which would entail creating a working group of warehousers, truckers, and shippers to see if a workable plan could be developed.
- Double decking of SR 836 and SR 826.

The next meeting was set for Wednesday December 6, 2006 at 3:00.

A lengthy discussion of the MPO Board vote on the 6th Street Slip ramp followed. The discussion centered around what the Committee could do better, and if a Commissioner could be found to revive the issue.

.